

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEVADA

13 RONALD NEAL JOSEPH, SR.,)
14 et al.)
15 Plaintiffs,) 2:09-cv-00966-HDM-LRL
16 vs.)
17 LAS VEGAS METROPOLITAN POLICE)
DEPARTMENT, et al.)
18 Defendants.)
19 _____)
ORDER

20 Before the court is plaintiffs' objection (Docket No. 100) to
21 the magistrate judge's April 25, 2011 order (Docket No. 99), which
22 is erroneously titled "Objection to Magistrate's Ruling [56]". The
23 court shall construe this motion as a motion for this court to
24 reconsider the magistrate judge's April 25, 2011 order (Docket No.
25 99) that granted defendants' Motion to Stay Discovery on *Monell*
26 Claim (Docket No. 75) and denied plaintiffs' Motion to Extend

1 Discovery Deadlines and For Sanctions (Docket No. 88). Defendants
2 have responded (Docket No. 101) and plaintiffs have replied (Docket
3 No. 103).

4 The court has considered the pleadings and memoranda of the
5 parties and other relevant matters of record related to plaintiffs'
6 motion (Docket No. 100). It is well established that the scope of
7 discovery is within the discretion of the court. *U.S. v. Williams*,
8 791 F.2d 1383, 1387 (9th Cir. 1986). The magistrate judge's ruling
9 (Docket No. 99) is not clearly erroneous, contrary to law and/or an
10 abuse of discretion. See Local Rule IB-1(a); Fed. R. Civ. P. 26,
11 72. Accordingly, plaintiffs' motion (Docket No. 100) is DENIED
12 and the magistrate judge's ruling (Docket No. 99) is AFFIRMED.

13 IT IS SO ORDERED.

14 DATED this 10th day of June 2011.

15 
16

17

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26